

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD**

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.15164 of 2007

DATED 22-8-2007

BETWEEN

Nandu Bai

.. Petitioner

And

The Land Reforms Tribunal-cum-Special Grade
Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional Officer,
RR East Division, Ranga Reddy District.

.. Respondents

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.15164 of 2007

Oral Order:

The petitioner herein purchased an extent of Acs.239.06 guntas in Survey Nos.145 to 158 situate at Thummalur Village, Maheswaram Mandal, Ranga Reddy District under a registered sale deed dated 14.6.2005. After coming into force of Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 ('the Act' for brevity) the petitioner or her family members did not file any declaration. However, one of the petitioner's vendor K.Yadgiramma filed declaration and she was declared as surplus landholder. The petitioner alleges that Yadgiramma had no right to the lands and, therefore, she ought not to have filed the declaration. The proceedings under the Act were completed. In May, 2007 the petitioner submitted an application before the respondent to set aside the orders of the Land Reforms Tribunal in CC No.I/112 of 1975. By impugned memo letter No.I/112/1975 dated

18.6.2007, the respondent informed the petitioners that her request cannot be considered as there is no power vested in the Tribunal to review the orders. This order is assailed in the writ petition.

The learned counsel for the petitioner relies on the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in **P.Satyanarayana v. Land Reforms Tribunal**^[1] in support of the contention that in the event of fraud and misrepresentation, the Land Reforms Tribunal can suo motu review its orders.

The provisions of the Act or the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1973 do not confer the power of review in Land Reforms Tribunal. If a person is aggrieved – whether such person is a declarant or a claimant or an objector, the remedy of such person is only to prefer an appeal and then a revision to the High Court. The petitioner, admittedly, did not file any declaration though she was allegedly holding land in excess of the ceiling limit. In such an event, the respondent was right in rejecting her application to set aside the original proceedings under Section 8 of the Act. If the petitioner is aggrieved, her remedy is to prefer an appeal, if it is permissible under law.

This writ petition is misconceived and it is accordingly dismissed.

V.V.S.RAO,J

Dated 22.8.2007

msv

^[1] AIR 1980 AP 149